

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Claims 1, 11, 20, 21, and 34 have been amended. Claims 40-44 have now been cancelled, while claims 5, 9, 10, 18, 19, 24, 28 to 33 and 39 were previously cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to for failing to define “tangible” computer storage media. In response to this objection, Applicants have removed references to “tangible” computer storage media from the various claims reciting computer storage media. Instead, these claims now require that the claimed computer storage media have an application or instructions physically embodied thereon. Because such the physical embodiment of instructions is both statutory subject matter and well described by the present specification (*see, e.g.*, paras. 36-37), Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present objection to the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The pending claims, claims 1– 4, 6 – 8, 11 – 17, 20 – 23, 25 – 27, and 34 – 38, each stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn, *et al.*, U. S. Patent No. 5,751,287 (“Hahn”) in view of Straub, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,905,492 (“Straub”) and further in of Gautestad, U.S. Patent No. 7,039,860 (“Gautestad”). Applicants have amended the pending independent claims, claims 1, 11, 20, 21 and 34, in response to this rejection. In light of these amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 – 10

Independent claim 1 has been amended and now recites the following aspects:

- an explorer residing as a single item in said data store and housing a first set of data defining a query that identifies one or more desired field

entries, and wherein said explorer further houses a second set of data defining an explorer display schema;

- the shell browser is further configured to identify, for at least a portion of the one or more item-types represented by the selected items, one or more of said default item decorations that do not conflict with said explorer decorations and to present the non-conflicting default item decorations along with the display of the selected items.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hahn, Straub nor Gautestad teach or suggest any of these newly-added aspects required by amended claim 1.

In setting forth the present rejection, the Office Action relies on Hahn to teach a data store with items having field entries. The Office Action, however, states that Hahn falls to disclose an explorer or a shell browser. As such, the Office Action relies on Straub to teach an explorer defining an explorer view schema and a shell browser. The Office Action concedes, however, that Straub does not teach an explorer defining a query to be used to select items with a given characteristic. Thus, the Office Action relies on Gautestad to teach such a query and a shell viewer for displaying items selected by said query.

First, the cited references clearly do not teach an “explorer residing as a **single item in said data store** and housing *a first set of data defining a query* that identifies one or more desired field entries, and wherein said explorer further houses *a second set of data defining an explorer display schema*,” as now required by claim 1. To be sure, the Office Action relies on two separate references, Straub and Gautestad, to teach the claimed first set of data (defining a search query) and the second set of data (defining a display schema). Given the need to resort to two separate references to teach the claimed explorer, it cannot be said that either of these references teaches, or even suggests, a **single** data store item defining both the query and the claimed explorer display theme.

For example, Straub addresses “themes” that may be applied to a user interface, i.e., the desktop screen. Straub’s invention allows “customization of and integration of multimedia resources into a graphical user interface of an operating system of a computer, and more particularly . . . [allows] integration of themed multimedia resources into the graphical user interface.” Straub, Field of Invention. Likewise, while Gautestad teaches defining a query, there is no disclosure by Gautestad of storing such a query and an associated display schema.

Second, the cited references also do not teach the claimed shell browser that identifies “for at least a portion of the one or more item-types represented by the selected items, one or more of said default item decorations that do not conflict with said explorer decorations and to present the non-conflicting default item decorations along with the display of the selected items.” There is simply no contemplation by the cited references of the claimed approach for presenting items with decorations defined by **both** a default shell schema and with an explorer schema. Indeed, none of the references teach or suggest identifying, on a type-by-type basis, the various default decorations that do not conflict with the decorations defined by the customized explorer view schema. Moreover, the references do not contemplate the presentation of the non-conflicting default decorations, along with the explorer view schema. Thus, for each of the three reasons articulated herein, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2 – 4 and 6 - 8, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 11 - 27

Claims 11 – 17, 20 – 23, and 25 – 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn, in view of Straub and further in view of Gautestad. Applicants

have amended independent claims 11, 20 and 21 in response to this rejection. For instance, claim 11 now requires “identifying, for at least a portion of the one or more item-types represented by the selected items, one or more default item decorations that do not conflict with said explorer decorations and presenting the non-conflicting default item decorations along with the display of the selected items.” Independent claims 20 and 21 now include similar limitations.

As previously discussed with respect to claim 1, the cited references do not teach or suggest the claimed approach for presenting items with decorations defined by **both** a default shell schema and with an explorer schema. Moreover, there is no suggestion in the references of identifying, on a type-by-type basis, the various *default* decorations that do not conflict with the decorations defined by the *customized* explorer view schema, as now required by the amended independent claims. For instance, Straub applies its themed-views in the environment provided by a traditional file-based organization of items (as provided by the Microsoft Windows 95 operating system), not in accordance with an explorer schema and non-conflicting aspects of a default schema. Likewise, Hahn and Gautestad also do not teach the claimed definition of view properties. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 11, 20 and 21 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicants also submit that dependent claims 12 - 17, which depend from claim 11, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 22 - 27, which depend from claim 21, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 21.

Claims 34 - 38

Claims 34 - 38 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn, in view of Straub and further in view of Gautestad. Applicants have amended independent claim 34 in response to this rejection. Claim 34 now requires “storing an explorer as a single item in a data store.” As explained with respect to claim 1, the cited references fail to teach or suggest a single data store item defining both the query and the claimed explorer display theme. Indeed, the Office Action relies on two separate references to teach various aspects of the claimed explorer. Thus, the prior art fails to teach or render obvious the claimed invention, and Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 34 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 35 - 38, which depend from claim 34, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 34.

CONCLUSION

If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547